Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Alright, good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. This is the ALAC Executive committee conference. It's Friday, the 24th of June 2011. The time is 1434 local time, and we have a full agenda this afternoon, and I think we need to get through it as quickly as possible, before they take all the furniture away and take our connectivity away, so we'll start immediately with the review of action items, the first point in the agenda.
	Review of action items from the 24th of May Executive Committee and 24th of May ALAC meetings. So the action items from the 24th of May Executive Committee meeting are as follows, and I'll read through them and note which ones are completed and which ones are not. Matt to inform Roman that many links on www.At-Large.ICANN.org , especially on the language pages, according to Cheryl, still go to Social Text pages. That was completed.
	In fact, as a small extension to this, some of the discussion lists also pointed to st.ICANN.org, and I found out that when going to the admin, myself, I could change that, so I have done so. Seth to add interim officer titles to the future challengers – oh, Alan?
Alan Greenberg:	Does that mean there shouldn't be any anymore, or we have told someone and they haven't done it?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Alan. Yes, the talk part has been completed. The confirmation that it was done or not has not been received yet.

Thanks for pointing this add. Seth to add interim officer titles to the future challenges Working Group Wiki page; completed. Before Singapore, ALAC members to familiarize themselves with the various ALAC Working Groups, roles, memberships, etc., and that is in progress.

Of course, we had a session on the Working Groups, and I think we made good progress on this. That is still in progress, of course, because we still have to make sure that the ones that are going to be shut down will be shut down and archived, etc., and the ones that are going to be recycled, shall we say maybe, or kept alive, need to be revived one way or another. And maybe should I suggest that this remains an action item, an action item from this meeting, actually.

So that's the first action item from this meeting. Olivier to work with the Katim, Board, and GAC to set time for multi-stakeholder call prior to Singapore. That was completed. Olivier to lead the broad distribution of the ALAC statement on the EG8 forum, that was done. Cheryl to continue debriefings regarding the selection process for the At-Large selected director; that's still in progress.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record, it still is in progress, but it's progressed as far as a couple of particular recommendations, at least coming back, so we're starting with face to face, which has allowed me to collect physically, some information which I wasn't able to collect other than physically.

So I'm hopeful that in the not too distant future, we might have a draft to circulate.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic, thank you very much Cheryl. Seth and Gisella to contact Annalisa and Fouad regarding scheduling remote participation for improvements projects meeting in Singapore; Olivier to follow-up, and that's in progress. Seth, do you have an update on this please?

Seth Greene: Yes, thank you Olivier. Seth Greene here; Annalisa actually attended our one hour work team co-chair's meeting here in Singapore, and will hopefully be helping significantly with the completion of the Work Team B aspect of the improvements final report, and Fouad has not gotten back to us. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Seth. Should I suggest an action item of trying to continue the search for Fouad? And Cheryl, you have a suggestion?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I do indeed; I would like to suggest that we do not do that, and the reason being, there is a particularly tight timeline, there was very specific briefings, there was particular templates materials, and there was also a little guidance that I set down and personally gave

Annalisa to make sure that what comes out of the process is what, certainly I know, we want.

So I think punting it back to a two by two type relationship instead of her just getting on and doing it could be fraught with danger, you'll end up with the same mismatch of "I thought you were and you thought I was" and I'm not willing to risk that happening again. So I would not leave that as an action item, I would in fact suggest that if anything happens – if anything doesn't happen in the appropriate times, then we need to look at that.

To be honest, I'm at the point where I see no reason, now that everything is clear and that expectations are clear, and guidelines have been established that this can be done in a very short time. Just for the record, the email that has been used for list information is not being read by Annalisa, so things were going out into the ether and not coming back, and not being acknowledged, because they weren't even known about.

And she had, in fact, been assured that her co-chair had all this in hand and it was happening. But of course when the copy to her to say what was going on wasn't getting to her, so we just had a mismatch and it's fixed now. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Any other comments or suggestions? Okay, I see no one waving their hands at me, so I gather there are no objections to this, in which case, no AI, as long as the process with Annalisa is moving forward. Sorry, my microphone went off.

EN

Next we have the ALAC meeting of the 24th of May action items; and there are several action items there. The first one being staff to send out Doodle for first meeting of Working Group on future challenges. This was sent out and a first meeting on future challenges has taken place. Any update on this? Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Just the results of the meeting; there was an election of two co-chairs, myself and Jean-Jacque Subranet, and Danny and myself were charged with going and making a charter and that work is still underway.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Any comments? No comments, so next action item is Alan to – sorry, I missed one. Staff to send again to ALAC the call for ideas on ALAC/registrar collaboration. That was completed. I'm afraid very little feedback was received, which meant that when the Executive Committee met with a set of leaders of the registrar constituency, we had a discussion to further what we had talked about before, but the action item from that was to again send to ALAC the call for ideas on ALAC/registrar collaboration; specifically the ALAC to send – and when we say ALAC, At-Large, the whole of At-Large – to send questions to the registrars that internet users would have, questions and education material that would be useful for internet users.

This is the first collaboration of its kind, and we seem to have the ear of the registrars at the moment for such collaboration. What it

would mean is that we would put together a common website that would include all of this information, and that would be a vendor non-specific, or is it non-vendor specific information for registrants, such as "how do I renew my domain name if I don't know who my registrar is?", "what happens if I lose my domain name or what should I look out in finding a good registrar to purchase my domain name from?"

I'm just throwing ideas at the moment, but I'm sure our users, our At-Large structures, will have a fantastic set of questions that their local users are asking. Any comments? And may I say that since we do have guests also here, I also invite guests to be able to submit any comments or questions if they do have. I see no one moving, so we'll move to the next one.

So that's still in progress, perhaps as an AI to be carried over, and the next one is Alan to look into which ALAC member is on the WHOIS Working Group, that's the first thing; and second thing, regarding the technology evolution of WHOIS service, to forward to At-Large the call for expertise for a drafting team to develop the WHOIS service requirements survey. And that was initially sent to the GNSO liaisons list. Alan, would you have any update on this please?

Alan Greenberg: To be candid, I'm looking at this with some puzzlement, because I – the answer is no, I haven't done either of those, and I'll put it

back on my to-do list, but I'm not sure which WHOIS Working Group we're talking about in the first section.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think, if I remember correctly at the time, I think that Carlton, you were not on that call because you were traveling at the time. So this is why, I think, we punted the question to Alan and – microphone please, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: There is a WHOIS standing Work Group for the At-Large but unfortunately there are only two persons who are signed up to it; and that's me and Garth Bruen. That's it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Now, Carlton, do you think it would be worthwhile maybe issuing a call to the wider At-Large membership to get more people in this?

Carlton Samuels: We can do it again, but it has been done – to my certain knowledge – at least three times already.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Now, have we forwarded an At-Large call for expertise for a drafting team to develop a WHOIS requirements survey – and that question is both to Alan and to Carlton?

Alan Greenberg:	I have not, I will try and dig out the document or the email and forward it, if I can find it.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, thank you Alan.
Carlton Samuels:	Right, that is still in progress.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Next, every RALO to forward its advice on ALS applications from NetMission.asia, I believe, not Aziza. And ISOC can get Calcutta to the ALAC as soon as possible, by the end of this week if possible. It was completed, I understand that that mission was accepted as a new ALS, and ISOC India too. Is that correct? I see Cheryl has her hand up. Cheryl?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you very much, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Just obviously, those of you who were at the APRALO showcase would have heard that the NetMission ALS and the other ALS were both welcomed there, but I think what's exciting about the NetMission ALS is the opportunity to get new theory proactively involved in all of this. They have some extraordinary materials, and this is why I'm mentioning it now, in the Executive Committee.

They are sponsored, unashamedly and very effectively by .asia, which is required to put some of its funds back into local and tech community activities region wide, and this is one way they're doing that.

They have some very, very interesting programs, but also an enormous amount of enthusiasm and willingness to work at least in English and their Chinese languages to help any other regions or areas explore some of those things, where some of what they do is transportable to get youth and youth interest in this area. I'd love to see what the NetMission guys do, sort of replicated and sort of virally spread; that would be wonderful.

So I think at a future point in time, I'd be encouraging the At-Large executive to meet with all the regional leaders involved, or whoever had the task for their outreach, and we get some of the NetMission presentations and we actually do a webinar. So it's not only just captured in real time, but we have it as an asset later.

I also would like to report that we have interest from this meeting for a new Indian At-Large structure. It is, in fact, a new group whose name I will not even attempt to garble, for the record, but I can tell you what they do. It comes from one of the fellows here, and the organization she is representing here is – they do access centers, so they are places where people come and access the internet, so there is a name for these things, I just can't possibly think what they are. Little hubs that you can go and do your facebooking from. Anyway, that's what they do, but they do an awful lot of local education, and there's a lot more to it than that.

So it seems to be that she will be emailing me directly, because we met through [William] in DNS and obviously then the fellowship committee, the fellowship program.

I would like to say this is an ALS we should be able to get up fairly fast, and I will be looking forward to having that happen in the next couple of months. The only other issue that I might raise that we do need to look at is I've had a couple of individual people from Asia Pacific, while we're here, come and ask how they could get involved in our activities, which really puts the pressure on our region, but I expect all regions to look at some form of colonization or intelligent way of having individual members brought into the fold.

But right now, I think we might need to suggest that we might encourage the regions to open up their meetings to non-members to at least have observer status, and that's another thing I'd like to put on the regional leadership agenda, out of these new ALS activities. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Any comment regarding this section item? Yes, Sergio?

Sergio Salinas Porto: For the record, Sergio Salinas Porto. One question, Cheryl. Sponsoring by .asia of these organizations, is it contradictory with your work within the region when you have to discuss things that

.asia is doing wrongly? This is a question; I'm not making any statement. This is simply a question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Perfectly happy to answer it; absolutely not. They act absolutely independently, their voice is clearly heard and we have a full, frank, and fearless discussion if we need to. Do remember the complexity of our world that we come from, and at the moment we find absolutely no reason to be criticizing .asia in what they're doing, anyway.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Any follow up question or statement, comment? Oh, Edmon Chung, guest.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, hello. Here I was defending you, and I didn't need to. Sorry.

Edmon Chung: It comes better from you, I think, and please do not hesitate to criticize .asia, because it's important; that's wearing my .asia hat. Now, and also for the NetMission program, they are very autonomous, and you know, we do fund some of the travel, but just like ICANN funding a lot of travel, they work very autonomously. And we are proud of that.

But now sort of wearing my ISOC hat now, I was curious. Cheryl mentioned a point in terms of individual observer status of

participation; I wonder what the status is, in fact, with Asia and others. I think it's certainly worth considering; I know there are historical reasons for considering otherwise, but I was just wondering in the current situation whether other RALOs, what do people think in general, and how do we get that started?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Edmon. I'm not quite sure whether we have the time now to discuss this specifically, but perhaps we could have an action item for a future call. That's an important and interesting discussion to have. The problem we have today, of course, is we have a very limited time to deal with a lot of subjects, and of course we'll end up with absolutely no tables, no microphones, no nothing in a couple of hours. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perhaps – it's not perhaps, let me start that again. It's absolutely Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the transcript record. Perhaps it might be an action item that we could draw from this that we have a dedicated discussion in the not too distant future, and make sure it is a multi-regional conversation.

I would perhaps, under these circumstances, like to think that if we are going to be building our Dakkar agenda, it could be something that's in a condition and has been discussed sufficiently for it to be on the regional leaders and secretariat's agenda, which means we've got to do work between now and then, so that they can be actually making decisions and defined conversations; I think that's

an action item we can take on the executive to try and get into the general ALAC and regional agenda. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Perhaps. Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, absolutely, so let's make this an action item please, and I gather that you've got that, Seth. Thank you. Now regarding the next action item, and that's the staff to set up a big pulse vote on all four of the currently pending applications, following APRALO sending its advice on NetMission, Asia, ISOC India, Calcutta to the ALAC, etc., etc., etc., that as all completed.

That was done and in fact, four, is it five, all five votes were sent out, all five votes were accepted. No, all five votes – sorry, all five regional advices were accepted and the second screen has gone off now, you need to press the space bar. And log in. And so four At-Large structures have been agreed and have been allowed and one has been rejected. Right, next. ALAC and regional leadership to subscribe page change notifications on the monthly reports Wiki page so that immediately – this is a – I don't know who's written this one, but it's a dyslexic sentence.

So that – let me try and think, so the liaison and other monthly reports are updated, we actually get notification. In fact, we've also recently had a bout of spam attack, with comments being posted which didn't make any more sense than this sentence. So I would imagine that if staff actually had – or someone in staff subscribed to all of the pages, they would be able to track what was

going on on the ALAC pages. Any comments on this? Let's make this an action item, please. And it's a lot of pages to subscribe to, but it's better to keep track of what's going on.

Next, Olivier to inform Katim Toury, JAS Working Group and GNSO of the ALAC's plans and hopes to organize a multi-stakeholder, Board, At-Large, GAC, GNSO, etc., call with the JAS Working Group to plan a meeting in Singapore. That was completed; meeting in Singapore did not take place, although a large part of the ALAC/GAC meeting that took place in Singapore actually was dedicated to the subject of joint applicant support. Much progress was made, I think; I can see from the corner of my eye, Evan wishes to say a few words about this. So Evan Leibovitch, and then Alan afterwards.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, this is Evan. In addition to the actual discussion that took place during the GAC/ALAC meeting, there was a subsequent meeting of a small team of individuals, five from At-Large and if I recall, I believe it was about eight from GAC of people involved in putting together a commentary that has been reflected in the current GAC communiqué, in reference to the Joint Applicant Support group, and may indeed still lead to additional instructions and advice to the Board on helping to move forward the JAS work.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:	Yeah, I don't know if you want to do it now or under other business. I think we need to take some time to focus on the schedule that is driven by the Board resolution. That Board resolution that turned out was not what I thought it was going to be, based on what I remember Peter saying in the Board/GAC meeting on Sunday. The timing is significantly different than I thought it was, and perhaps impossible to achieve, but I think we need to focus on that a little bit.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Alan. I'm not sure whether we can do that now. Perhaps – perhaps, yet again.
Alan Greenberg:	We need to do it before we leave today.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	We do; so maybe in any other business, because we are taking on a bit of delay here.
Evan Leibovitch:	actually, I intend to take it up during our meeting with Kurt Pritz, because it involves staffing support and the current events. So it may help dictate whether or not we're prepared to meet these deadlines.

Alan Greenberg: There's also the issue of –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alan, please say your name.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Alan Greenberg. It sounds like we're having the discussion now, which I didn't intend to. One of the issues is the Board resolution calls for a staff implementation plan to be ready for the Board to approve in Dakkar. We don't even know how long it will take to create that plan, and then there's issues of getting through the ALAC and getting through the GNSO, both of whom have to approve the substantive comments, not just pass on the report. And as I said, the timing looks like it's going to be very, very critical.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I just noted and I apologize that I wasn't watching more closely, the question raised during the previous agenda item, if you wouldn't mind if we could return. I've just asked Matt to bring up the spreadsheet to show where, indeed, the more recently received At-Large structure applications are – while Matt's doing that, let me say that to the best of my knowledge, this is in the current

beginning of staff checking the accuracy and the due diligence process; we are tracking on time for the recently applied applications.

As soon as we get the big up on the middle of the screen, or at least the url for it into the chat, you can use that link to check on where your application is at all times, so it's being processed is the answer, and I do apologize on behalf of us all for not having noted your very valid question at the time it should have been raised in the agenda. And we will just put the link for you, to the document that will show exactly where your ALS application is tracking for, and keep looking at it. It does get updated quite regularly. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for noting this. For the record, the question was from [Amaran] at the Urdu Internet Society in Pakistan. Moving swiftly on to the next action item, which is the ExCom and Olivier to draft an ALAC statement on draft financial year '12 security and stability and resiliency framework. That was drafted, thanks to all of the community input from the five RALOs, it was drafted by Tijani. Thank you very much, Tijani. Do you wish to say a couple of words, or shall we just move forward?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So regions brought their inputs, and starting from these inputs, I understood all this, I prepared a draft statement, and after that some people commented and I introduced these comments in the

final statement, and this is the last statement that you have voted approved yesterday.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Maybe I should switch back to English as well, after listening to you being interpreted in English. So we will move to the next thing, and that needs to be marked as completed then, this action item. Next one, Alan to draft and post the ALAC statement and proposed ICANN process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership restrictions from existing TLDs. The comment period ends on the 1st of June, 2011, and the initial draft completed and Alan to post final wording on 24th of May. Alan, would you have an update on this please?

Alan Greenberg: My recollection is we posted it, we voted on it, it was submitted, it was ignored. I haven't actually looked at what came out of the comment period to see whether they made the change, but since I did not see any reference to WHOIS in the summary of what changes they made, I have to presume it wasn't made. But I guess completed is the answer.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Alan. The next, Tijani to draft ALAC statement on draft – that's funny, that's déjà vu. Oh, well actually it is not, no, because one was the Security, Stability, and Resiliency framework and the other one was operating plan and

budget ready for community consultation. I think we might have made a small mistake here. So the FY12 Security, Stability, and Resiliency framework, which one is the one that we submitted the report for? The second one?

Yes, the first one was not, so let's amend the record, that the FY12 Security, Stability, and Resiliency framework we did not supply a comment for, and the FY12 Operating Plan and budget was the one that a statement was sent for. Next, ALAC members to review draft ALAC statement on draft FY12 operating plan and budget, ready for community consideration, as soon as Tijani posts it on the ALAC Wiki. Done, done, done. I think we can move on.

If we have any questions or comments from anyone? It's already on the Wiki. Okay, next, ICANN open policy issues. Let's have a look at how we're doing, because we're a little bit late, and I wish to find out if our guests have arrived. They've been startled. What we might do then, might I suggest that we move the open policy issues to after we have spoken to our guests, and may I therefore invite to the table Kurt Pritz, and Carole Cornell. There are remote participants you can actually see on the screen, and we have a few guests here as well, so it's not just the ExCom.

Kurt Pritz: Thank you, you people must be the last ones standing, right? When we go outside this door, and there's nothing left of the meeting, everything's gone. The participants are gone, the booths are gone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a bit of a principle we're rather proud of.

Evan Leibovitch: Give it a few minutes. They'll start packing up while we're still sitting here.

Kurt Pritz: Don't sit still for too long, you'll get packed.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But we hold a key to the buildings, so we have to lock up after we leave.

Kurt Pritz: That's right.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If I could just remind everyone to say their name before they speak, for the transcript records, and also for the interpretation. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: This is Kurt Pritz from ICANN, thank you for having Carole and I join you. Somewhat remarkably, this is a kickoff to a discussion it seems like we just concluded about the Strategic Plan. And so part of what we're going to show you is a timeline for moving forward,

so – and where we are kicking off this process now and hope to bring it to a close by the end of this calendar year, and then rest for a while on Strategic Planning.

So the intent of these slides is to – you want to go to the first slide, Matt? -- is to really discuss the process and timeline, and then just start a dialogue about what you think about the Strategic Plan is posted, how it might be amended, there were some changes in the last Strategic Plan, and how those can be approved, and so on. So that's where we'll go in the meeting, so I'll kind of breeze through these slides and then pause for questions.

I think the outcome, once the outcome – to the extent we get specific input on ICANN Strategic Plan, that's good; but certainly what we want to do is leave here with a really clear road map for how we're going to interact on formulating this next version of the plan, and to make sure that there's the appropriate opportunity for input. And then I want to ask for your help on a very specific item that's in this year's Strategic Plan, how you can help part of that be accomplished. Matt? Matt's multi-tasking. Evidently so is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. So I always put timelines up in really small font.

Carole Cornell: So hopefully you can look on Adobe Connect.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah. Edmon might remember this story. Edmon might remember, during one of the new gTLD presentations when everyone was

very angry about missing timelines, they asked if I was going to post another timeline. I said "Yes, but I'm going to use really small fonts."

So this, if you can see it on your computer a little better, really describes a process where we are bringing the Strategic Plan home by September, so it describes quite a bit of intense activity over the next six months, where we really want to have a couple of iterations. We want, you know, input to the extent we get it now, but then input between now and Dakkar and a posting of what we think is a draft, and then with that draft we can really get down to brass tacks and ask you for specific recommendations.

So it's sort of a two step process, where this first step is really the open-ended kind of questions and then taking what we've heard so far and some other inputs, like what's been done, and amending the Strategic Plan and then getting specific, very specific about it. Okay Matthew. So it's about the Strategic Plan, you know this stuff, the Strategic Plan is written around these four missions in ICANN's by-laws.

Carole Cornell: I think everybody knows that the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan has four components in it, and that's really important when you look through and look at the feedback and the type of input we're looking for. If you look at the Strategic Plan, it started with the very first part, which is influences versus control, and how that has changed over time. But it's also where we see it today.

The second component is to do the four strategic pillars here, and that was something that did get refined last year. The wording has changed, some of the components within it got refined, and that was due to some really good work here, where you guys gave us some direct feedback. The next part of the plan was kind of the written description, a little bit about the environment, and some of the, if you will, specifics within the plan. And the fourth part is something that got added last year, which is the strategic metrics.

We've heard quite a bit in the meetings today; a little bit this week, about how the community would like to have a little bit more specificity over some of the metrics, so that's an area that we do think, and we think there will be an opportunity for you to give us some very good feedback, a little bit about that whole model of where do you want to go, so what's the right metric that you think we should be measuring, or starting to collect the appropriate data towards measuring that would be really helpful to hear.

The other element is that a lot of the projects have goals and timelines, so how does that fit into some of this? And some of the initiatives you guys are working on play into that very well. So having said that, that is where this slide and what the point of it is, and looking at that discussion point. So if we could take a minute, and I'm sorry Kurt, I interrupted you, but I think it kind of needed to be said, what those four parts are, to remember to be thinking about them, what kind of feedback we want.

Kurt Pritz: So keep going, this is good.

Carole Cornell: So looking at the four focus areas there, the first question might be, to get a big picture is, where do you see ICANN in the next three to five years? What's changed? What direction do you – and this is a good point to kind of pause for just a minute and see if people have some specific items that they want to bring up at this point, or I can keep going, but I think it's a nice, natural spot to stop for a minute, and say is there something specific in the next three to five years that you think you'd like to bring up at this time?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Specifically a clarification on just the DNS security and stability line, or are we going to do this pillar by pillar?

Carole Cornell: I thought we would just take it as a global component and not do each one, because I know we only have half an hour and this is what – to kind of introduce that idea, and to ask you to come back if you have more, but to kind of – if there's something that's pressing on your mind now, that we should be conscious of or aware that you'd like to see us include.

EN

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Terrific. Thanks for that, Carole. Cheryl again, for the record. Because, obviously, some of us and some of our original leads have far more interest in one or other of the pillars, so to open up now I think would be good. While I have the microphone, because the Chairman hasn't stopped me yet, he might soon, is just make the point that of course, in both the first two pillars, we do have the beginnings of some serious reviews and some ongoing work groups.

The DSSA work group, a very rare thing where you've got your two SOs, two of your, three of your ACs and the support of the others, looking at cold hard metrics, how we define them, and everything else. I think this is going to be one of those longevity ones, something that's going to wear through the whole three to five year plan, and probably feed into the third layer as well as your first and second layer that you were describing.

And of course, I would also point out, and hand over the mic as soon as I do, that the matters of competition and consumer trust and consumer choice is out of the previous Board resolution, is work now. The gTLD program is – to one extent, at a different stage. We've still got work to do on it, but at least we've got those arguments behind us.

Something that we are now going to, perhaps, have more human bandwidth to think about, but each one of our regions would have very different views on that, but that's where focusing when I assume you will be talking to each of our regional groupings, and

doing the socializing that we've seen happen before on the strat plan.

It might be a good idea to really look at those things that are probably going to be more interesting to get from them, and that would be number two and number four in the pillar group. To be honest, we're all going to say pretty much the same stuff about the other two. Thank you.

Carole Cornell: Thank you, that was helpful feedback, Cheryl.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Cheryl. Thank you, Carole. Next on the queue actually, Evan Leibovitch is on.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi guys. I guess it's a bit of a relief things aren't quite what there were to begin with this week. By the way, congratulations, Kurt. It's been an awful long road, there's been some things we haven't always agreed on, but you've done a tremendous job in getting this across, and it's a real good piece of work, and thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Thank you for saying that.

Evan Leibovitch:	Now, a couple of questions. As you know, At-Large is very heavily involved in the joint applicant support work. And, in the slide up there, would you consider that to be a sort of ongoing work from the gTLD program or would you consider that in something completely different?
Kurt Pritz:	I don't think the label really matters, it's…
Evan Leibovitch:	Okay…
Kurt Pritz:	We're treating it as a prerequisite to launch, though.
Evan Leibovitch:	So, I don't know if it's appropriate at this point, but there is a number of people in this room that are on the JAS group, and one of the things that has been discovered – especially because of the extremely compressed timelines – is that fact that we're going to need some staff support. You know how some folks…
Carole Cornell:	Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Can I have the podium? But one of the topics here is the Strategic Planning, not the budgetary requirements and staff analysis. I think we should have the JAS work group discussion outside of this agenda, really.

Evan Leibovitch: That's why I was asking if it was appropriate on this slide before I started.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think that we might need to push this till afterwards, in the other part of the -- once we're finished with the presentation, basically.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, then I'll continue with things that are specific on this slide. On the competition consumer trust and consumer choice, there are a couple of fronts that are being moved on. One is a direct action item from the workshop that was held, and of course there's also work on the ongoing consumer constituency. We've been working with Rob Hogarth on that.

On the issue of the healthy Internet governance echo system; one of the things that sort of struck me was a bit of a disjoint between what we see in the Strategic Plan and the allocations that have been available on a budgetary basis. For instance, and I don't know if this is a question for you folks, or for Akrim or whatever, but there is a disjoint between what is strategically suggested and what is actually allocated for when the budgets are drawn up.

So maybe this is a very high-level thing. There had been, obviously, a lot of conversations between At-Large and the financial staff about budget issues that had been put forward, and what's been prioritized and what hasn't. Without touching on any

specific issues, it's essentially been brought across to us that priority has been given to finance activities that help engage the existing community, but outreach activities – those that try and go deliberately out and expand the reach of At-Large and perhaps other communities- for instance the goal of At-Large of having at least ALS in one country on Earth.

The goal of trying to bring more people into At-Large that are not the traditional parties – are not contracted parties, civil societies or others that would normally find ICANN anyway - the kind of outreach that At-Large has to do. When it came time to put forward budget issues, there was actually response back saying that the prioritization was for engaging existing communities to the expense of outreach, of bringing in new ones. That seemed, at a high level, to be a bit of a disjoint between the Strategic Plan and the funding allocations. I'm wondering if there's any comment on that.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, well certainly we aspired to both. I just want to recognize that, in this year's budgeting cycle – which is always fairly hectic – we all attempted to invent a new process within a process, a play within a play, that was a solicitation of community requests for specific funding and them some sort of decision on how those funds could be allocated and which ones got funded and which ones not.

And I'll tell you from what – I wasn't the budgeteer this time, but watching on the inside – it's a very hectic process of receiving the inputs and trying to prioritize them – trying to explain why decisions were made. And that's probably why you saw a decision that said we're prioritizing existing over outreach, which is not quite the right nuance you want to hit in that. And so, just not only the prioritization but the explanation of that in a compressed time period was awkward, so I think there're some lessons learned to be taken from this first try at taking community inputs in the budget.

I think all our goals is to encourage outreach and increase the size and quality of the ICANN community. Cheryl, did you want to make a point on that, because I was going to go on and say something else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yes, specifically on that. And I think there's another opportunity I want to make sure got into the record; and that is as we start to move from this single fiscal year budget issue to perhaps being able to look towards two and three years, which will bring us into better sync with Strategic Planning.

That's also going to make all our lives a great deal easier, and again – Edmun is going to support me here – Asia Pacific in particular has had extremely bad luck in the timing of fiscal years and the ability to put in any meaningful – well, basically we haven't had a single thing supported other than Bali in our

formation meeting, which we did at an APRICOT meeting anyway. I think that sort of says it all, but it's all got to do with the timing of year in single financial year and the cycles. I think there's opportunity. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: So, remember that I was going to ask your help on a certain item that's sort of related to this. Now there's really two. One is to try to create a plan with some specificity about outreach that we can help get funded. So if we have, like, a long-term look at outreach. You know, you want to keep it strategic, but you want to make the goals as specific and measurable as possible.

And then when identified I think it'd be more expected – you know if it's expected then it'd be more likely to be included in the ICANN budget, so maybe we can develop a strategy together for putting that stuff in the Strategic Plan so it's much more likely to be included I funding. So that's number one, and then go ahead, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not just a conversation between Kurt and Cheryl, but I do hold an ability to jump in. I'm sorry, no I'm not – don't even think I'm sorry. On that, we also have an issue where we have been with

global partnerships for quite some time, and in discussing at length with that team about how we can work smarter, not harder.

So again, more opportunity but you need to recognize we've done an enormous amount of work between communities, regional leads, ALSs, global partnerships that just haven't had the enablers. We've got the willingness; we've even got the thumbnail sketch in some cases. But don't bring us back and come to us as if it's a really good idea, thanks guys, because we thought of it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Cheryl. Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: And then the other is, and this current version of the Strategic Plan remember we created a line item about ALAC advising the Board and giving it a – I don't know how we put it in there, but we wanted to make access to the Board more direct, or be specific about how the Board accepts ALAC advice and drew on the GAC model for that.

So, I would like your help in formulating that model, tempered by – the ALAC is not the GAC so it's different, the Board's going to consider it differently, to help build that model. Now that we put it in the plan, I want to put a Board paper to the Board that we put this in the Strategic Plan, here's the goal.

Here's a model for doing it. So I want to work on that board paper and submit it in the next few months. So, to the extent we could

work together on ideas for how to do that so we can fulfill that strategic objective.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Kurt. Just touching on the previous point, we do have the strategic objective of having one ALS in every country; so for the outreach, it's particularly important.

Touching on this specific point, there has been a discussion on the amount of ALAC output. We have had an enormous amount of statements sent out this quarter, since last meeting – I think it's 16 – and so the Board has actually asked whether they need to consider each and every one of them because it tends to flood them somehow.

So there has been a question as to whether we should prioritize or give it some A to D priority for those statements that we feel particularly strongly about. We're not speaking about not having as much output as what we have, but speaking about some output being a response to public comments being copied to the Board with a lower priority than some output where we feel particularly strongly and which the Board has to take as an action item as soon as possible.

First I saw Alan with his hand up and then Carlton. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'll get on a hobbyhorse in semi-public that many of you have heard in private. I very strongly believe that we should limit things

that we send to the Board, other than perhaps a semi-monthly summary or something, which they can ignore if they want to. We should restrict what we send to them as to advice to the Board. I don't think we any longer have to remind the Board that we're active and keep on showing them copies of our public comments and things like that.

They know where to find them if they really want to, and I don't know if our public comments warrant any more focused attention by the Board than anyone else's. So yeah, maybe once every two months a one-page – literally one page – summary of our -- pointers to our statements, but let's make sure that when Board members get something from the ALAC they understand this is significant enough that they should actually read it and not have eyes glaze over because it's another thing from the ALAC.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. The idea was actually whilst all of the statements would be sent to the Board, those that are marked with a B or a C class – that are marked by us or chosen by us as being B or C class – would be stored and would then be collected into an update in between the meetings that the Board has when they do have time to read it.

Alan Greenberg: I understood that's what we were talking about. I'm disagreeing. The Board is inundated with many, many, many things. We don't want things that – say they come from ALAC regardless of flag –

to be relegated into the "we'll store it away and maybe read it someday." I want them to be unique enough that they warrant attention when they come in.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I've always supported that position, and let me tell you why. We run the risk of becoming – sending spam material to the Board. I really do believe that we need to do two things; the things that we emphatically feel strongly about, we send to the Board. That does not stop us from making public statements, but what we send to the Board must be far and few between. I really think that.

So while I agree, it's a way of prioritizing. What I am saying, that it's only the things we consider the top priority that goes to the Board, not everything at all. It does seem to me that we need to – and there's another reason for me saying this, too. There we have a heavy workload, and there are a few of us that are working hard and lots of others that are hardly working.

I don't believe that it is sustainable, because we are going to begin to see the quality of output deteriorate over time. It's for those two reasons why I continue to support Alan's view that we should only send to the Board things that we are very strong about. We make our public statements, and even then we should choose what public statements we make. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Very briefly – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, and perilously close to bringing ourselves back to what we should be talking about, which is the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan, of course, did mention that this was something last year. Do we need to have it again this year? I don't think so, and the reason I don't think so is twofold. The recommendations coming out of the ATRT and the specific statements today in the Board meeting that indicated that the subcommittees of the Board were looking at the issue of how this is being dealt with, so thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Back to Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: Besides what the ALAC chooses to the Board, I was thinking more of mechanisms - the pull mechanisms rather than the push – that the Board is on notice that on these types of issues it should consult with ALAC. But then, I think that's exactly where the ATRT and that stuff is going. But I was just talking to Carole; you know Carole and I have worked together for about 21 years. I forgot what I was going to say – oh, that we want to capture some of the metrics amount the amount of work you're doing for this, to report on it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Kurt. Carole?

Carole Cornell: In the spirit of time - and I looked at the watch and realized we've pretty much given up the time now through the half-hour – I just wanted to cover a couple more points that would be useful if we could, and then we will request that if you have some suggestions, if you'll use the timeline that was shown. You can see there are two big, distinctive points where we would like to get your feedback. So, I think that's important to say.

So having said that, the next thing on here that was brought up is what's changed and what are the strategic initiatives, which was the slide we were on; and so you brought up the New gTLD Program. We talked a little bit about the variants. If there's a metric like this, with the JAS Working Group where you want to be able to measure the amount of developing countries or something like that, that's a great strategic metric we might want to consider, and it's something that's near and dear to your team.

So as you're thinking about that, know that there's a metric because there's a goal that you want to get to. That would help us in putting it in this 3-5 year strategic goal. So that's why I wanted to come back to what you said. The next piece – and if you could go to the next slide, please. The next slide that's up here talks a little bit about one of the four areas, which was the strategic metrics.

Now, I'd like to say that metrics can take on many forms, and they can quantitative. They can be qualitative. They can be trend-oriented. They can be trying to achieve a goal, like 100% of something. So, they can be all of those things. Not all of them work for everything; so one of the things that I hope that we might get from the At-Large at this time is if there are some that you think are appropriate, or that you'd like to see for your areas of interest, that would be helpful because as you know, if you looked at the 2011-2000-current Strategic Plan, in there it sometimes says 100% of uptime.

Well, that's one example because it has to do with DNS security and stability. It has nothing really for competition and choice. So, I'm just trying to explain a little bit what I think would be helpful, and if you'd like to get some more information about metrics as you go through, feel free to ask us a little bit more questions and we'll provide that kind of information.

Kurt Pritz: I'll address the point now. I just want to insert – we're in the process – we have a separate project for measuring the metrics from the last plan, a separate effort. So as we measure them, that's going to kind of teach us where there are good metrics and hard-to-measure metrics. To the extent that you have input on -- So we're going to publish those measurements, so we want your feedback on that, too.

Carole Cornell:	And that will come out in the between now probably and Dakkar, you'll see some of those metrics come out. That's important to know. If you'll go to the next slide, please. This just talked about dependencies because it might impact a little bit of where you go with your strategic thinking, like range of participation and global business community. You know, those are things just to be conscious of and that's why they are on the slide. I'm not going to talk into specific details of each slide, but you can see that that's what this is – definition of the global stakeholder service level metrics. It's those kind of things to remember when we're pulling that data together. It's just a helpful tool.

Lastly, on the next slide - thank you, Matt. This is about what are the next immediate steps, so some of the dialogue today we are going to take back and capture, and apply to developing that first 2012-2015 Strategic Plan and we'll also continue some dialogue as we've talked with the different groups and continue that. So, that's the first step. The next is we're going to develop this first draft – if you will – which will go out for public comment like we have been doing in the past – 45 days – and encouraging you to know when that is in the timeline so if you could correspond it with some of your ALAC work that it will dovetail – I think – nicely.

And I think this is the reason why we're trying to do something that we weren't as effective last year. We started to slip the schedule last year and we had a hard time getting to that end date. So, we're hoping by just having these three or four markers - and one of the feedbacks we've got is if we could do it year after year

rather than just, here they are for this year, here they are for this year. One of the things, internally, you'll hear us talk a little bit more is tying in the Op plan and the budget and the timing of that. We have heard that feedback. It's one of the things that you guys immediately said one of the meetings that I sat in, so we've heard that message and I wanted to say that aloud.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carole. Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: Can we have a two-minute discussion? If you could shed some light on your process for getting input on this plan; how do you go to the RALOs or the ALSs or is there a – I'm trying to figure out how to run our timeline and our consultation with you so it coincides with the work you try to do.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Kurt. Could I first ask – can we roll back to the actual timeline? Because I think that would be really helpful for us. And then Cheryl wishes to take us through this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I will do my best and hope that the regional leads will jump in, because I'm obviously talking from one strata and this is actually affecting the next level and the level below that as well. How we like to do it, as opposed to how it's done, perhaps, we might like to

suggest. For quite some time in Strategic Planning development, we've had staff members from the strat planning team come and talk to teleconferences in each region.

That to me is the most robust and most effective model that we found to date. It certainly works better than this committee as a whole, particularly because what we do then is ensure that as many At-Large structures and individual members are either at that meeting or access the transcript and the recording from that meeting. The earlier that can happen in the process, the better. If we get our dates, we have fixed dates for regional meeting.

We can tell you exactly when from July through to 2055 when our meeting dates are. Once or twice they'll slip because there is an ICANN meeting in the middle. But beyond that, for these things, they should be a really high degree of predictability. So I'm pretty happy with the early kickoff. I think we can make this work well.

Then what happens is the ALSs need to go out to their membership, discussions happen, we put up Wikis, confluence works, regional information and commentary is gathered, the regional leads tend to pen a regional approach so you'll get an APRALO view and an AFRALO view. And then usually Tijani because he's just so darn good at it, brings the whole thread together. So, you then get an ALAC perspective on it because a lot of what you hear from different regions is unified. But there are particular things that are quite variable or different. Have I done justice to it, Tijani?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and I see approval from Tijani. I had a comment with regards to the Strategic Plan draft timeline, which my colleague at EURALO might wish to actually agree to, which is that the July 2011 open public comment forum for input, and I gather that that probably closes some time in late August. This period is a time when most Europeans are away on holiday and are totally unable to function.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brutal honesty, it's what you get in this room, brutal.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And many other people as well, but Europeans primarily.

Carole Cornell: So my question for that might be, if you know year over year that this is now becoming a routine timeline, could you not think ahead of that window, and if you need some information or we should have things supplied to you to help do that, or a webinar that gives all that data at one time, and then that one time will allow you the extra time you are thinking maybe necessary because of that situation, and that's why the year over year idea I mentioned came up. Also, if we'd given this to you and you'd come back and say, can you meet with us on this date then we can supply it, we'd be very willing and cooperative to do that as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That would be very helpful, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Particularly when you keep doing things in the beginning and end of calendar months, and we have regional leadership which meets at the very beginning, and we have a RALO that meets at the very end. And that, of course – you think you're socializing something in the month of June, but if APRALO doesn't meet till the end of the month, they actually need the next month or more to get their information back. And that's during the open public comments. So we sort of get out of sync and so, yeah, that would be wonderful. Thank you, Carole.

Carole Cornell: Good point, Cheryl. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Any other comments or input on this specifically? I don't see anyone moving forward. I guess we can then move to – do you have anything else to ask of us, or any closing – oh, sorry Dave, I didn't see you.

Dave Kissoondoyal: In the last JAS Working Group meeting, some ideas for support were for registrants, some ideas for support for registrars. I think since we are talking about support in a broader sense should be one

of the strategic objectives. And then there are various ways and means to have the metrics, because we can pull the stats before support being provided, especially in developing countries and get the stat after that support is being provided. So I think support should be one of the strategic objectives. Thank you.

Carole Cornell: Much appreciated, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I ask a question, Dave? Would you say that sitting in the security pillar or –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: None of you are saying your names at the moment, so that was Carole who said thank you, and then Cheryl –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl is now intervening, sorry – and not, again, sorry. Would you see that feeding into which of the four strategic pillars? Would it be – that support would aid the security and stability, or the resiliency, or what? Where in the pillar model might that fit? I just wondered.

Dave Kissoondoyal: I think, to be given – any category on one of the pillars, it's the strategy committee to decide whether it fits in one or the other, but

I'm talking about support because support is becoming an area of concern. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dave. I heard that Cheryl wants to talk. We need to talk, but that's probably later. Any other – yes, at the end of this. I just wonder if you have any more, any other things to tell us, basically.

Kurt Pritz: No, this is Kurt. I had asked my question. One of our takeaways though, is on our timeline. I think we're going to wind up making a few timelines. One for different stakeholder groups, so we can incorporate your processes into that timeline, so we'll be more educated. Plus at ICANN, we tend to make one timeline, and every stakeholder group has a different process, so it doesn't always work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I wonder, Oliver – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, if we should take an AI, and you might encourage other parts of the ICANN community to do the same, to actually give you a sample of our dates and our whatevers. I'd love to see ICANN have a shared calendar one day, but that would be a Utopian dream, I suspect. But you know what I mean; so you've got some cold hard facts, you have dates we have, I think it's something we can do for you, and you might encourage the others to do so as well.

Kurt Pritz: And then we'd work with Matt and Seth. I'll figure that out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, and the timeline by the way, is very much appreciated. Too often do we have to suddenly mobilize resources at the very last second, when most of the resources are gone on holiday. So it's certainly extremely important to have that. Any other closing statements? Then in which case, I can also ask if there is any other business, to ask you questions, and I see that Evan is frantically waving his hands, so Evan, please.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. This goes back to something that was touched on, but moved aside on an earlier slide. Essentially, you're aware of the joint applicant support Working Group, and the work that needs to be done in an extremely compressed time frame. We've been charged with, between now and Dakkar, to come up with what almost amounts to a second Applicant Guidebook for needs assessed applications.

Could I possibly – while I'm not empowered to speak on behalf of the Working Group, I think most of the other members would share this need and the fact that we badly need the staff resources from somebody like Margie. Carla has been fantastic for us, but we're going to need additional resources over and above what she's already been giving us.

The kind of wordsmithing skills that we need to take the rough diamond that exists right now, in the work of the Working Group, and turn that into something that would become a Guidebook, an instruction book for applicants that need support; what they need to do, what the criteria are, what the mechanics are going to be. We have an awful lot of work to do and an awful short period of time. Carla has been fantastic for us, but given what we're asked to do, we're going to be severely under-resourced.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Would you like to comment? Okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, Evan is talking about specific requirements to support the group; I'm looking at things from a slightly wider point of view. The Board resolution says that an implementation plan has to be in place – given to the Board in enough time for them to make decisions, which essentially means the beginning of October. That leaves us exactly three months.

We need some feedback, very quickly, from staff to the extent of how late – are you planning to work in parallel with us and implement things as we go along and change them? When do you need an approved report from the GNSO and the ALAC in order to finalize or pick and choose among your alternate implementation plans?

When we start looking at the cycle times for the ALAC, and particularly the GNSO to approve a report, which in the case of the GNSO definitely means going back to each of their stakeholder groups and constituencies, to be slightly cynical, we may have passed the date already.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Any more questions, or do you have an answer for us, Kurt? You do? Perfect.

Kurt Pritz: So I think three things; one is the current state of the report, I think, as far as criteria for meriting assistance is pretty good. I think it's pretty close. It can be somewhat daunting when the Board says "you need to go invent something that's not gameable" because then you start saying "this is almost an impossible end", but what we want is something really good, right, and relying on people who will need will apply for it, and the most important thing is to provide assistance, and the second most important thing it to make it not gameable to the extent we can.

Evan Leibovitch: Not to mention the fact that now we have the Board mentioning specifically about the fund. We have specific mention about the possibility of fee reduction; there's been advice from the GAC. All this needs to still be built in, before we can even work on the details.

Kurt Pritz: Right, so certainly we'll provide more support, because we understand the need for more support. I'm not going to talk about individuals yet, because then I'd get in trouble. I wonder, my other practical suggestions are these; I wonder to what extent some of this already exists in applications for grants and criteria for grants and you know, maybe the form of staff support is to do some research into where some of this product already exists, that we can borrow from. That's my second point.

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan. That's exactly the kind of thing we need. I mean, whether it's writing or research or all of the above, we need that kind of help.

Kurt Pritz: So my third really practical suggestion goes back to the timeline, because my understanding of it is if an applicant wants to apply for a new gTLD, they want to know whether or not they have financial support before they make that decision, so the support has to occur earlier, so the process has to be ready earlier. So we somehow have to work together on developing solutions in parallel, working very closely together.

We have some signals from the Board about where they might want to go, so I think we need to not make it – not make this process to serial, that we're watching the JAS work and we're

watching the drafts, and staff or others aren't saying anything about it until the report is released, and they say "well, we don't like that part." So I think we got some, I don't know is Sebastien wants to add, but we got some clear signals from the Board this week about where they want to go.

To the extent we can, we should just drive together towards a set of things we know are acceptable, we think are acceptable to the Board, and you know, work together on those. So you know, I'm really loath to say it, because a little bit of corruption to the bottom up process, but on the other hand, I think we're working toward the same thing, and that is having some form of aid implementable in time.

Alan Greenberg: Given –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Did I tell you to speak?

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry. Go right ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm sorry, Alan. I'm getting really tired. First is Alan, and then we'll have Carlton.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry; I hadn't realized that was in any way annoying. Given what we went through in the last couple of months with the GNSO, given that the GNSO has now semi-officially signed on and said they support this whole-heartedly, but given that they still have very strict and formal processes for approving things, I think you need to speak to GNSO leadership and try to figure out with them approving, what the minimum timelines are for getting things to them. If we simply let nature take its course, they have a meeting in July which we will not meet deadline for.

Their next meeting is in September, something like that, which according to their normal processes, they could defer it until the next meeting, which would be October, and past our deadline. They may actually have to do something, and I've sat on the GNSO Council for five years, so I'll use tongue in cheek, sort of, but they may actually, heaven help us, have to schedule a special meeting for this.

I don't believe this has ever happened, at least not in my lifetime, so – I think it's going to take some extraordinary action in dealing with them to come to closure on it, but it has to be done real soon. The JAS group has been really good about pulling a paper out of a hat when they didn't know there was a due date two weeks before. We probably don't want to do it this time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Carlton? One of the co-chairs of the JAS Working Group.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair. I'm following Alan, because that's what I wanted to point out. We are in a situation where we have literally three months to finalize a report. We have a situation where one of the chartering organizations, by virtue of its processes, I don't believe we'll ever get to the point where they're going to say they've stamped for approval.

So perhaps the approach that we're going to have is that we have to have a finalized report with some placeholders in it. Okay? And probably what we would need from you, Kurt, is probably a preview Evan, of where the placeholders are, to Kurt, and then we will find out from you what it is that you can do to help us fill out those placeholders. That seems to me the approach to make.

Evan Leibovitch: If I may expand on that, just to be –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's Evan now.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, this is Evan, for the record or whatever. What the JAS group, what it's next course of action was after coming up with the second milestone report was actually trying to do a redline version of that report and trying to flesh out specific areas where more

detail was needed, decisions were required, where that polishing was required.

So the next step now, the group is going through the milestone report and finding those components which are good as is, and finding out all the other pieces that need fleshing out and need a bit more decision making and need a bit more detail.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan.

Alan Greenberg: Just for clarity, Evan said we have three months for a final report. We have three months for a final implementation plan.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. And Sebastien wishes to add a few words.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I think this week has been very productive for this subject, because you specifically, ALAC, so a lot of outreach and meetings with different constituencies in ICANN, and I really have the feeling that you are going to the right direction. My advice is to take into account all, but now you have to take into account GNSO because they are a co-chartering organization, but you have to also take into account GAC, because you started work with them.

It's not the same situation where before you were two, now you are two plus GAC plus the Board. So it's something to reinvent. You are not yesterday; you are after one week of hard week, so take that as a win, not as a trouble. If you have trouble with one of them, it's go. And I will say, to add to this picture, you have the staff willing to help you. I heard Kurt clearly saying that we will help you; now we are entering in a new area.

Don't spend too much time on the past, go to the future. Try to do two things, to separate two things. I think it's not your job to do implementation; even if you are not a policy organization, it's for you need first to finalize what you want as policy level. When I say policy level, it could be the money, how the money will flow; what you will use as element to determine if one application is a good one and your criteria, there may be something already existing for that in the Guidebook, and you must discuss that with the staff.

They know ever better than every other person in this room what is inside the Guidebook and how it's supposed to work. And if I say the timeline, we need an approval by the Board in the October meeting in Dakkar, then the implementation itself must be done, and the way that the applicant must be able to apply before the twelve, first twelve – not twelve one twelve. Here you are also three months of what you need to take into account as planning.

If we have a policy decision completely in Dakkar, I am sure that the staff will have started to work on some issue on the implementation phase, that means that before the end of

December, you could have a plan accessible to everybody, and it's a little bit late, but as you will already have a policy decision, we can start to outreach the future candidate, and it will be made even before, because we are supposed to open the page with the new applicant and the ones who are waiting to help before the end of the month.

I say it's a tight schedule, but you have all the tools in your hands to make that a success. And I can assure you that the Board is willing to help you, and globally, and some members more than others, but take that as a deal and I am sure that you will deliver. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Sebastien, and I hear from Kurt that this is the sort of timeline that would work. So thank you for all this advice, and this of course has been recorded, so I guess we'll have to come back to this and put our own timeline into perspective for this. Any questions or suggestions? I do realize time is passing by, and we have spent nearly an hour with Kurt and Carole. You're very welcome to stay with us for another couple of hours; we have plenty of questions. But Cheryl Langdon-Orr first, let's go quickly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I was waiting to see what Danny Younger might have been typing in. I'm just briefly reading and I believe it is very much on the next topic of conversation, not on the Strategic Plan. So I just wanted to double

check in case we let you escape before a strategic planning question was asked. He may disagree with my judgment there. Olivier, you may want to make the final call.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl, and I haven't had a chance to read that paragraph.

[background conversation]

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, this is Evan. As I'm reading what Danny's saying he's talking about the objection procedures and the funding procedures on the gTLD Guidebook. That may be a bit much to get into the discussion right now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I move then, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, that this be taken. We'll get an AI, we'll send it to the necessary places which will have your email address on the top of it I think, Kurt, and you will undertake obviously to get back to Danny. But copy to us all because it's obviously something the community's interested in. That works, yes? Good.

| Olivier Crépin-Leblond: | Action item taken. Thank you very much. Well, thanks very much, Kurt. Thanks Carole, for spending the whole hour with us rather than just half an hour. We take it that you love us for staying here for so long. |

| Kurt Pritz: | Yeah, first prize is half an hour with us, and second prize is an hour with us. |

| Olivier Crépin-Leblond: | We're happy for all of that. Thank you. |

| Kurt Pritz: | Thank you very much. |

| Olivier Crépin-Leblond: | And have a good break post-ICANN meeting. |

[Applause]

| Alan Greenberg: | For those who care I point out this is the time that they said the internet will go down. |

| Olivier Crépin-Leblond: | Right, so from now on I guess we're working on borrowed time. |

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've been doing that for years.

Matt Ashtiani: I actually asked the IT guys to see if they could extend it a little bit so we may get lucky.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Matt, and I believe a few Singapore dollars might help. And I didn't say that so we'll have to strike this from the record, of course. I would never, never warrant any such encouragement, of course not – even for more work for ALAC.

But back to agenda item #2 – it was budget, yes. Agenda item #2 – open policy issues, which we skipped a little bit earlier and I guess that we have to return back to this. Of course I have to open it as well because it disappeared from my screen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mr. Chairman, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the records. I question whether we actually do need to deal with this, but to my knowledge there are not a lot of new calls coming out that we're not currently aware of, other than the ones, things like the Strat Plan that we now need to know about. This is an iterative process, I know it's a standing placeholder in the Executive Committee agenda but I think immediately postpartum of the New gTLD

Process being announced as a go live on the dates for that, I'm not sure that there's anything really looming at us. So thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Actually there is. We had a policy discussion that took place earlier this week but unfortunately Alan was not able to take part in it. We reviewed the comment periods which were still open and which are looming upon us, because would you believe it – there are comment periods that we were asked to-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, let me be clear that we haven't dealt with at our last meeting. So between our last Executive Committee meeting and now there's new ones in?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Fine, well they certainly need to be looked at.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So for this maybe should I punt over to Alan?

Alan Greenberg: If you tell me what the subject is I will. I don't have a list in front of me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. Well, there was one which was the new GNSO Policy Development Process and which we wanted to find out from you whether something was going to be filed.

Alan Greenberg: I did discuss that with some group and I can't remember who it was anymore, but I do remember having the conversation. What I said was I personally plan to submit a small comment on something but I don't think it's an issue that the ALAC really needs to comment on. It was respect to the non-voting NomCom appointee being able to object or to ask for delay. I said I would be reading the document over again and I'm not expecting to find anything that I see warranting ALAC comment, but if I do I will alert you perhaps by the time I get back home very late Sunday.

That's the status of that one. I'm not expecting us to have to do it, I don't think we need a courtesy one just for whatever.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Next one – New gTLDs Communications Plan.

Alan Greenberg: I haven't read it so I don't have a clue. I'm sure we'll have a comment if someone actually reads it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	But that comment period ends on the 15th of July. Carlton has read it? Oh, I see Edmon is putting his hand up. Edmon Chung.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But that comment period ends on the 15th of July. Carlton has read it? Oh, I see Edmon is putting his hand up. Edmon Chung.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Edmon Chung here. Well I guess this is something that well at least personally I've fought for, at least for it to be put out to public comments. It wasn't there until I think it was maybe today or at most yesterday, because it was brought up at the Public Forum that this wasn't- We didn't know why the plan wasn't put out for comments. I think it is very relevant for ALAC and you know, I would like to suggest that we do try to put something together in response.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, and obviously if that's there then the answer is yes. Certainly we definitely need to do. I'm now opening up the place that we look at for these public comments and yes, it's suddenly there. But that was the exception not the rule, and I thought we actually had discussed that at our last Executive Committee meeting, Alan. Your point, I think it was us that you discussed that.

Alan Greenberg:	I know I said it at this table sometime this week but I don't have a clue who else was around the table at the time. Wasn't I called back from another meeting to discuss it, I think?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you. So in order to have something done could I ask Edmon perhaps whether you, since you seem pretty eager and well in the know.
Edmon Chung:	I'm happy to help draft something to get it started, but I'd like to get a lot more input from it.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Well what I suggest of course, because we are running out of time and we might soon run out of power altogether is to ask this to be an AI as an immediate action item, to collect information and of course to set up a Wiki page for this, which is our usual way of collecting information.
Alan Greenberg:	We better have reminders by middle of next week.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes, absolutely when we'll be back in our own countries and awakened from a very long two-week sleep. Next is the preliminary issue report on the current state of the EDRP, and I've

heard a lot of noise around the corridors here but I wonder how much noise do we need to make. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: My personal opinion is number one, we should not… It's an important policy which has been on the books for twelve years or so, and a periodic review is a good thing. There have been statements that have been made that the Work Group model is not up to doing something as complex and technical as the EDRP. I would like to see a comment made on that, that if that's the case then why are we dictating that the Working Group model is what we must use for everything else? Either it's not up for everything or it should be good enough for that. And that I do feel warrants a comment.

The intellectual property community has essentially said if we open it up we're going to open it up for a lot of things, and "Boy, are you going to be sorry." I'm translating slightly but not a lot, and that may well be true. I think the middle path that people are talking about now is some sort of a review group but not a PDP, but at least let's start getting our cards in order and understanding what the issues are; and that's probably something we could support if it was proposed. I'm not sure we want to be the one to propose it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Any other view from any other…? Ah yes, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and I'm not countering Alan's view at all, it's just we had two things in the same conversation so I agree absolutely with the EDRP. I just wanted to come back for one moment and suggest that if we're going to do something in a short time for the New gTLD Communication Plan, not only do we need to get the Wiki page up – we need to see Michele Jourdan to see who can either provide us with material to push out to our edges, give us videos that they may already have put together or webinar opportunities; or just darn well come and talk to all our regions because we shouldn't have to go and pitch it.

It shouldn't be looking at it. I've just read it, it wasn't that hard to read – I literally just read it. So it could be easily done as a webinar or something.

Alan Greenberg: Just for information, is it in multiple languages already?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Before I give the floor to Carlton, two things – one: yes, the document is not that large, which says a lot about the New gTLD Communications Plan; the other one

being that there is a video that has been released by ICANN and I do have a link to that video which I think I might circulate if there is no more official link to that video. Maybe there is a more official one – I have an unofficial link to it – which effectively is a marketing video or a sales video as some people call it, selling new gTLDs. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair – Carlton Samuels for the record. As Cheryl pointed out, the big problem I see here is if you look at the number of messages that they want to relay, that alone sends up a red flag. You don't have a good communication plan when you have so many messages that you want to give. It's not going to work, at least not based on the objective of the plan as I read it. That's the first thing I notice, and perhaps, Edmon, when you look at it you'll see the disconnect between the objective and the multiple messages that they are proposing to send. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. May I ask a question actually? The new gTLD Communications Plan is aimed at registrants, isn't it? Because I just wonder whether this is… Potential registries, right, so yeah, it's not even registrants – it's potential registries. So is this something that today affects users and should we devote some of our time, which at the end of the day should be there to defend the point of view of the users; should we divert some of our time to working on this? Evan had his hand first and then Alan. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: We definitely need to; I just don't know if we're other the same constrained timeline, because first of all registries have to know how to get involved with this. But we have to send out a message of what this means to end users. I think that the conversations we had with Scott Pinzon earlier-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Evan, but the question being we are asked here, or rather there is a public comment that is open here for New gTLD Communications Plan. If you look at the draft it's a first draft – it's not even formatted in any specific way. Does one need to be involved?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olivier, could you just read exactly what this public comment is asking for? I've got the microphone, I'll do it – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record: "We seek the public suggestions on strategies that will help us leverage our limited budget and the strengths of ICANN's volunteer community." That's what they're asking for.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: This is a communication plan to attract registry applications. I think it is premature for us to start informing users about what it

will mean in sometime 2012 plus when these things start appearing. The only relevant part is to the extent that we believe that users will be helped by new gTLDs, that the internet will be a better place for users by new gTLDs, and I for one have not necessarily seen the convincing argument of that. Is there anything we need to do to make sure the right people apply for registries to achieve that end? I'm not convinced that we have a strong enough argument to make it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl and then Edmon.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll cede to Edmon. Go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. This is Edmon. I think a few things, one of which is that the whole plan itself, how it anticipates spending that money – of course there's a difference between the implementation or operations which the staff should take on. But I think in terms of a level that ALAC should be involved in is at least how they are spending it and how they are selecting suppliers. That is almost at a policy level, which is how they select their suppliers; a right way

to do this plan given all the constraints, given what we want to achieve. This is one aspect of which.

The other aspect of which, which seems to be the discussion, is whether users should be involved. And I think I've repeated this too many times perhaps – I think users, at least in two or three areas should be informed; one of which is they form the communities which some new gTLDs might claim to be representing. And that's why users need to know. And some registries may be coming up and saying "We claim that we are representing you," and therefore they need to know to make sure they're not misrepresented or they might want to join together or be represented. So that's one aspect of it.

And a related aspect if they do not wish to be represented, or they have problems with certain registries, they need to know that this is coming and be aware that this is coming or they may be too late to object or to do anything about it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Edmon. That's an interesting panel of views that we have here. Cheryl, do you wish to…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was hoping to bring us to close on this particular point by suggesting that it appears to me that we do need to do at least something, and there's certainly the resources that were exercised during the Asia-Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum

EN

recently, where the panel activity that had this topic – that's a battle that's transcribed, it's video.

We could actually use some of those to get some of this conversation going. I think there might be an issue where some regions will want to take more of a role than other regions, and if I dare speak for Asia-Pacific I'll repeat what I said before, which is in the cultural and language diversity that we have, to even find a way to alert potential registries that this is an opportunity is a task we have to be involved with. We have to get the right people talking to the right people and I think ALAC has a role and At-Large has a role there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. We have another guest here, Eric Brunner-Williams, who might wish to say a few words. Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Olivier; Eric Brunner-Williams for the record. Alan, yes, I believe you're correct in that it is targeted towards applicants, but the question has been muted about whether there's an issue for users. I want to suggest that cooperatives in 2000 were users and that Catalonians in 2004 are users, and that you substitute the word "communities" for the word "registries" or even "applicants."

So are there things to communicate to them? Well, I'm aware of one large ethnic community which may have an application made

apparently on their behalf which will be styled as perhaps a community application but actually submitted as a standard application for purposes of obtaining the advantages of no restrictions on registration policy.

So that's one issue to communicate to communities, which is the degree to which they may be used for purposes other than what they think they're being used for – "abused" is a good word, yes. But also is the information necessary? Is it exhausted when we run through the recital of Scot, Wales, Galatia, Britannia, the Basque autonomous region, the Kurdish autonomous region in occupied Iraq? At what point do we say "Well, that really is enough community involvement?"

And you notice I didn't say any communities in Africa, I didn't say any communities in Latin America; I didn't say any communities in North America, I didn't say any communities in a lot of places. Really the amount of information that's out there to communities at present is actually quite limited. Thank you very much for your time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Eric. That's very comprehensive and I seem to have, well, I hear quite a lot of approval around the room and it appears that the majority of people here do think that we need to comment on this. I have heard from other parts of ICANN also on the Board that it's too early to involve users; in fact we heard it earlier in the public comment where the Chair did say "Oh

no, users? We'll do that later. At the moment we're dealing only with potential registries and applicants," etc., etc.

So oh, Cheryl wishes to put her hand up. Well, she has her hand up already. Cheryl, you have the mic.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And I'm busy smiling because I can't help myself but bring this in. One assumes that the majority of the purpose of these new gTLD registries will be to serve some form or other of end user community, so perhaps we might need to encourage them to think along the lines that the disabilities sector internationally has finally managed to start to get some traction and make some changes. They might need to start to think about the mantra "Not about us, without us." Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. And so it looks like we are going to have a statement, and I've heard a lot so it'll be interesting to actually have the summary of what has been said here. I think a lot of it is very valid indeed and perhaps I could make up part of the statement. I do ask for a volunteer though to collate this. And of course, seeing as how everyone is fighting to be a volunteer, as per usual after this time... Oh, Edmon is fidgeting but maybe not; then, from the corner of my eyes I see Eric Brunner-Williams also fidgeting and looking away, in fact pointing the camera towards Alan but Alan is not really impressed.

It's that time of the week where we are not looking to get more work, even in order to get a few more bars of candy or anything.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I volunteer, I announce that into the microphone from behind the camera.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The person from behind the camera said "I volunteer," that's fantastic. Thank you Eric, Eric Brunner-Williams.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And but what I will ask, though, is if staff has the minutes that they will forward those minutes to you as soon as possible so as for you to be able to have enough material on your hands – and the transcript – without you having to rake your mind about what meeting, what time, when? Was that this year or last year? Right.

I guess we'll move to the next thing if I can find it… Yeah, but I can't even see that far anymore, it's glazing over. No, we still have the WHOIS Policy Review Team discussion paper, and I know that Carlton had spoken to us about this during the policy. So I think you've got that in hand – is that correct?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, this is Carlton. That's correct. I went to the WHOIS Review Team meeting with the Registry/Registrar Constituency and it was a very interesting and enlightening discussion taking place. Just to summarize, the grounding of their problems is two things actually. One is they are concerned that the IPC constituency and the law enforcement constituency believe that you can have a WHOIS that is 100% valid, and they make the case that that is impossible and it is irrational to even extend to do that.

Now that has an impact on the compliance and the compliance mechanisms in place. And I listened to it, and quite frankly they have an unassailable position – they do. There's no way around it, that's the first one. And the other thing that they seem exercised about was the cost; was whether the compliance effort, you could ever have a compliance effort if you look at the cost value relationship to the compliance effort – whether you would ever have enough staffing to do that based on how it is structured today.

And one of them –now you have to take it with a grain of salt because he's speaking from his perspective and he's speaking to a captured audience – he said "You know, here is a simple thing: we send out these notification mails as required periodically and some of us, we start sending them off six months before, three months and we go through" And he said "For those who don't think there's spam," don't think there's spam and that's a genuine response, he says "I will tell you that we had, we sent out, we did a test run of 1000," he said, some number, and they got 63 responses that required manual intervention to correct.

And he then estimated the amount of time it took to do that, and he said "We couldn't afford it, and even if we did it there's no way the Compliance Team, even with automated tools, could ever validate it." Now, if you know anything about data processing, that is also unassailable, and it left me thinking. It really gripped me because I sat there and now they were talking about process issues and I understood them, because that's what's my business – I understand how you process data.

It isn't that simple, it isn't that simple and I've been thinking about it. I have three pages of notes that I took, and I've been thinking about how we would fashion a response that is rational – *rational*. You can't go to this with emotion at all because the facts are what they are, and it's difficult to get around the facts. And I don't know what it is yet but I know that if we're going to make sense of this we have to have a rational response.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I hear you, Evan, and I'm very glad that you've taken much…. Oh God.

Evan Leibovitch: We're so very easy to confuse.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm starting to get very, very tired then. Now I am starting to hear Evan when it's Carlton that I hear. Okay, I hear you, Carlton. Thank you. In the meantime, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I yield the floor for the moment.

Carlton Samuels: Can I just add one thing that they said? They said one thing that I think should be guidance. One of the fellows said "The solution cannot arise if we focus on the two extremes." Just straight out he said you won't have a solution – which the extreme is the LE/IPC extreme which you're going to have 100% and the other one where everybody's a cowboy. You can't have a solution to this if you focus on the extremes, and I think it is absolutely right. I wrote it down and circled it because I think that's somewhere there, that's where we have to aim in our response.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. I guess the question is really where do we draw the line; what percentage do we have of cowboys and genuine? It's shades of gray. Okay. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It is nice to hear in an At-Large room that someone's saying that some of these problems are difficult and not just chastising people for not fixing them immediately. We have had ten plus years of no one, let's put it bluntly, giving a damn and some of these problems are going to be really complex to fix; and some of them nigh impossible. The only way forward, and I'm not pretending to give a specific plan, is to understand this is going to

take a long time to fix – we're not going to fix ten years' of ills in three months. We're not likely to achieve 100% but if we don't start putting something in place to slowly over a five year period probably, trying to fix the problems, we ain't never going to fix them.

So a lot of things: domains get renewed – renewal time is a great time to fix a problem. It's going to be spread out over a multiple-year period, but I appreciate the concept that we are starting to look at things from the perspective of all of the players, not just those who are offended by the fact that our data isn't right. And I understand the emotion behind it but I think we have to start putting on the hats, wearing the hats and shoes of the people who actually are expected to fix the problem and work with them to get to a point.

That doesn't mean I think they've always been taking reasonable positions. Those of you who have participated in my last two years of task force or working groups understand that, but we're going to have to work with them and they're going to have to work with us. And it's going to be difficult but that doesn't mean we don't start because we don't see the endpoint.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan, and perhaps this is part of the maturing of ICANN itself, which seems to-

Alan Greenberg:	Let's pretend.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Let's hope. And finally in our list of questions open for public comments we have the Second Milestone Report which has been put on there, which I must say is not very well labeled because it says "Second Milestone Report" when I hope it would be "Joint Applicant Support Working Group Second Milestone Report." I wonder whether there's any chance to have this changed, because it doesn't make any sense at the moment.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Yes there is. In my time as Chair I've had things altered and I'm sure you can as well.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Cheryl. So if I could ask staff to forward this to whoever it is… I mean I wonder if it's Karla to change this, because at the moment it's not very explicit. The question is does the ALAC as one of the chartering organizations wish to submit a statement or a comment on this? Cheryl?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you. I think the ALAC as such would be ill-advised to do so. I think we should encourage individuals, the cleaner, the man in the corner and anyone else to do so but I think as the ALAC, as the chartering organization which is supervisory to this process we

would be ill-advised to do so. But we should get out there and spend an awful lot of energy making sure the regions who certainly can, the ALSes who certainly can and the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker could do; but I don't think we should. Alan, perhaps you disagree with me, I don't know.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I think I had suggested in an earlier discussion that the cover letter, the one-page statement that we sent to the Board saying "We think it's good but it needs to be fleshed out" and that sort of stuff is the ALAC comment. It will not show up in the public comment field unless someone submits it on our behalf and it may be appropriate to deposit that just for the record, as it were. But other than that I would not recommend any further comment.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I wonder, Alan, if that's a matter of we all have the… Let me start that again, that Olivier as Chair makes sure that if we agree that's a good thing is done by directly liaising with the staff person in charge rather than having it just put in there as a one-pager… I

think that what is said needs to be taken into account when they do the tallying of opinion but-

Alan Greenberg: I don't think there's any way of making that happen unless it shows up as one of the comments regardless of how it's incorporated, but I don't really care.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: May I suggest that At-Large staff asks for this? Seth, would you be able to follow up on this, find out how we can have our intro page included in this?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl for the record. It's simple how we can have it included in this – we copy and paste the first page, we push it in an email and we press "send." I'm just questioning whether or not that is a valid exercise for the chartering organization. I think the material it holds needs to be taken into account and recognized as the statement and contribution to the public comment period on the JAS Work Group Second Milestone Report, and that could be done as an inquiry to the staff whose job it is to collate the public comment material. That's what I'm saying.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Ah, thank you Cheryl. Any other comments or none? The original question was do we want the ALAC to comment on its own

forwarding of the Second Milestone Report that it has chartered? And ooh, there's something a bit strange on the second machine. Oh dear, it's gone all over the place…right.

And that's it. We've gone through the whole list you'll be glad to hear, and oh, we're starting to run over business. So now because we do not have an item #4… Well, I guess we finished item #2 and we have action items on all that; #3 has been dealt with and #4 unfortunately Akram Atallah has not managed to make his way to us today. He did apologize a little earlier – he was having a meeting with the Singapore authorities. However, there is one thing that will happen and I have asked him whether it would be possible for the Chair and two Vice-Chairs to be able to speak to him whenever he would be available at a later moment in time.

We are staying here another 24 hours and he is also going to remain around for another 24 hours, so at short notice we will be told whether we can go and speak to him and push forward what we had spoken about earlier. To remind you what we have spoken about earlier and just to make it clear, the idea was to try and find a way to pool the three regional – what were called General Assemblies – into one batch, so that this one batch of people could be sent to the African meeting in Dakar, so as to offer the African region which is in most need of such inreach and could actually benefit from this; rather than none of our regions benefiting from anything – just benefiting from six people being sent and no General Assembly being done.

So I'll just ask the ExCom whether there are any additional comments they wish to make. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Assuming that this was to get some blessing, and inevitably that's always a challenge, but if this was to happen in a regional meeting whilst to be being organized at the Dakar meeting, I've already – and I'm sure a lot of us have been but I want it on the record, and I think we should raise it with Akram – I've already been talking to for example in my capacity as ccNSO Liaison to the people who organize the ccNSO Tech Day, there are a number of people who would be more than happy to run parallel events; and by people I mean parts of the ICANN community.

So we could actually have at the same place and time but made available for different people things like the Tech Day, and they were considering it could be more than cc but also bringing in g-training. So I just think that's something that we also need to let Akram know, that there is opportunity for even more bang for the buck to use those terms impolitely. Acting as Vice-Chair I'll recognize you, Alan – go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I was just wondering has anyone come up with a date that the people from Africa feel comfortable that they need as a drop dead date, that is "Tell us by a certain date or we're not going to be able to pull it off properly?"

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. If I may answer the question early, this is just at planning stage. This has not even been agreed or it's just an idea at the moment; it's still in seed stage. I would imagine that as soon as possible is probably the answer. Perhaps Tijani would like to add?

Alan Greenberg: I'll just point out I think that that information is needed at the seed stage to decide if we want to go ahead with this or not.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I wanted to ask Cheryl if she was talking about African ccNSO members or in general? AfrICANN, with regards to the data I have, the response is what Olivier has said – it should be official.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: How quickly do you think, how soon judging from travelling in Africa and so on, how early would you say that participants would need to be informed in your region? Does one need visas? That's the usual questions I have.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sure. Every meeting African people normally need visas to go to African countries, so it would be the same period needed. And sometimes it's more because some African countries have a more complicated procedure to get visas. And another point – not every African countries has an embassy in the other African countries, so sometimes you have to travel to get the visa. So it's exactly the same period needed for any other meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Tijani. So may I just suggest that staff inquires with Constituency Travel and finds out what the visa requirements are, just as part of being able to complete a dossier that we might need to complete in case we do go in that direction? The least number of unknowns there are the more likely it is that we will be able to make an informed decision on the subject.

Alan Greenberg: To be clear I wasn't just talking about visas. The whole concept of setting up an African Showcase and organizing a program and things like that, and bringing in a keynote speaker – all of these things take time and we have well under four months maximum. So the question is, I would expect the answer is if we can't make a go/no go decision in a month it's probably too late. I'm making up a date but I think we need something like that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You're absolutely right, Alan. And one more thing that I wanted to also add was to mention during our demands, not demands, sorry – our offer – that this would be a one-off. This is a one-off offer that we are making for this specific budget. I do not think that it should be… And that might be my personal view and I'd like to collect the view around the room, actually; I do not think that this should be something that we do every year, i.e., pooling of resources.

It's something where we are trying to basically make something out of however little money we are being given and we should have more than that; and it is the exception, not the rule. Thank you, Cheryl, for this – my mind is going a little bit slow now. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I think that the decision, Olivier, I think that the decision will be made very soon because it's yes or no. So we will have the answer very, very soon and then everything will go on.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Tijani, but it's just when we speak to Akram, the thing is if he does say yes we do not want this to be next year a question of "Oh well, you did say yes to something like this last year and this is going to be like this every year, and now we'll just give you money for one specific project." And I think that, oh – Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I think the concept of pooling our resources should be a one-time thing because hopefully they will never again give us little piles of money which we know we can't use without having talked to us privately first. We may well be in a situation, however, where in the future we do not simply take RALO requests and put them in a serial pile and pass them on.

We may well be in a position where ALAC should be looking at these things and then putting in an ALAC request, which may pool regional things and say "This year it's a time for Latin America, and yes, we know North America and Europe are also asking but we're not going to get that much money so let's be realistic." So I think we have to do our job so we don't have to recover from a stupid accounting mistake. But that doesn't mean it's the last time we're ever going to decide to work together cooperatively.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. I was going to say Sergio and then Cheryl.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Sergio Salinas Porto just for the record. Just to ask, because we spoke yesterday of having a statement regarding this issue and I would like to know how this should be implemented; that is, how we will organize ourselves to do that. Only that, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sergio – with difficulty. It's something that we… Well, it's unknown yet so we're going to have to find out. The

first thing that we will do is find out if there is a possible approval of this. The first statement will just be a verbal discussion and then as soon as we know if the door is open to that, at that point I think we'll probably have to make a quick call for this statement to be written on a Wiki page or something; if we wish to have a statement joined to the actual demand. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. The other advantage of course that we have is that as we move from an annual cycle, which is the current problem, to the three-year cycle, which is the plan, then this is a non-issue, okay, because we'll have better management issues. I'm kind of less concerned about having the statements, which could always be refused; but I'm very concerned about having, as we negotiate the possibilities, it's very clear that the sentiment in this room is as follows.

And I'm pretty sure your Chair has got a clear idea of what this sentiment is, which is this is a rarity. This is us showing how mature and flexible we are under difficult circumstances because we want the best thing in this very difficult environment. So I think two things will come successfully to our advantage. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl, and I must add that I will pitch this as being exemplary in ICANN because I think that looking at what happens outside these walls is sometimes a little bit different. But Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair; Carlton Samuels for the record. I just want to point out to you that as you pitch this as exemplary, if you take what Alan is saying which is what I believe eventually has to happen – we have to have a budget. Instead of having regional budgets we're going to have to have a budget that is an At-Large budget, yes, and that means you're going to have to make choices. And that is what we need to put out to the edges now – we're going to have to make choices. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. Oh, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. The reason I raised my hand again is actually I put my hand up and then I got distracted by all the important points you were raising, so I was responding to you. When I put my hand up of course you hadn't spoken, and I was responding to go a hearty "Here, here" to what Alan had said, and I have that absolute support that that is the model we should go to. And in fact, that was the model that in 2008 I think it was…2007, right – in 2007 the ALAC itself and the regional leads had proposed. We are now hastening slowly ever forward in a position to go back to what we wanted to do in the first place I believe.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right.   I think we've gone through this section, and the next section is any other business so the floor is open.   And surprise, surprise – Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.   You are going to miss me when I'm gone only just because you're going to miss the sound of my voice and all this dead air that's going to happen in the room. Now, I simply wanted to bring to the Chair's attention, because he may not have had time to get through the landslide of his emails today, knowing what his agenda's been like, that as a result of interchanges in the reporting from the various SO and AC Chairs this morning, Louie Lee, representing the ASO has written to all of the leadership including Olivier – simply copied to me and Evan, so that's why I'm talking about it, just in case our Chair hasn't had a chance to read it – and he's offering the opportunity at the next Dakar agenda, as we're preparing our next Dakar agenda to meet directly with the ASO.

And I think that it's probably about time that we did put that on the agenda.   I just wanted to make sure everyone knew where this concept came from and what the purpose of it was.   At the moment the GAC often has discussions with the ASO, ccNSO obviously it does.   They do a lot of cross communication but are going to do more formalized.   The GNSO have already said "Yes please, thank you very much," and I'd like to suggest in any other business that we do so, too.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Any comments? Eric Brunner-Williams.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Cheryl, I must have been asleep. Was that John Kern who asked us? It was a request from John or someone else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, it was a request from Louie Lee, the Chair of the ASO.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Any other comments? Right, in the absence of anyone saying anything against this I think this is a fantastic idea and we can go ahead with it. So that's another action item. Of course I'll have to find the email somewhere in my post, and I see "Loading message 3 out of 164." So we'll find out, and that's of course in the last ten minutes.

Well right, I think we're reaching the end of this meeting, I hope. I'm just not sure… Do we have any questions or any other business online? I don't see any.

There's about half a dozen people waiting outside the room, waiting to take this room apart and probably the building, too. Thank you so much to all of you for having survived this enormous

week. I don't know how many hours we put into this but it's beyond anything that I thought was physically possible. I'd also like to thank the interpreters for doing a fantastic job, including…

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And also thanking ICANN that we also had interpretation in Chinese, which was fantastic for this session.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And of course I thank the staff who have dealt with the sound. I must say we had a pretty good sound system and it worked pretty well, so thanks very much for that.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And now, the moment that everybody's been waiting for for the last nine, ten days is it? This meeting is adjourned.

[End of Transcript]